arXiv:0705.3370v1 [math.OC] 23 May 2007

Adaptive classification of temporal signals in fixed-weights recurrent neural networks: an existence proof

Ivan Y. Tyukin*, Danil Prokhorov†, Cees van Leeuwen ‡

Abstract

We address the important theoretical question why a recurrent neural network with fixed weights can adaptively classify time-varied signals in the presence of additive noise and parametric perturbations. We provide a mathematical proof assuming that unknown parameters are allowed to enter the signal nonlinearly and the noise amplitude is sufficiently small.

Keywords: recurrent neural networks, adaptive classification, nonlinear parameterization

1 Introduction

Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) with fixed weights are known to be able to solve problems of adaptive classification, recognition, and control (Prokhorov et al., 2002; Feldkamp et al., 1996; Feldkamp & Puskorius, 1997; Younger et al., 1999; Lo, 2001). When the objects to be classified are static, e.g. still images or vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the way the fixed-weight RNN solves problems is usually characterized in terms of convergence of the RNN state to an attractor (Hopfield, 1982; Fuchs & Haken, 1988). Each attractor corresponds to a specific class of objects and its basin determines which objects belong to the class. Conditions specifying convergence to an attractor are widely available in this case, (Cohen & Grossberg, 1983; Michel et al., 1989; Yang & Dillon, 1994; Chen & Amari, 2001; Lu & Chen, 2003) to name a few.

When the objects to be classified are dynamic, for instance nonlinearly parameterized functions of time of which the parameters are unknown a-priori, no adequate theory exists that explains why the fixed-weight RNN approach is successful. At present, theoretical results are

*Department of Mathematics, School of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Leicester, University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH, UK (e-mail: I.Tyukin@le.ac.uk); and Laboratory for Perceptual Dynamics, Brain Science Institute, RIKEN (Institute for Physical and Chemical Research), Wako-shi, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan (e-mail: tyukinivan@brain.riken.jp)

†Toyota Technical Center, Ann Arbor 48105, USA (e-mail: dvprokhorov@gmail.com)

‡Laboratory for Perceptual Dynamics, Brain Science Institute, RIKEN (Institute for Physical and Chemical Research), Wako-shi, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan (e-mail: ceesvl@brain.riken.jp)

available to demonstrate that a single fixed-weight RNN of a certain type can *approximate* the solutions of multiple dynamical systems (Back & Chen, 2002). Hence in principle, a fixed-weight RNN can behave adaptively with respect to changes of its input signals. These theoretical results, however, are restricted to the class of parameter replacement networks (Chen & Chen, 1995). The structure of these networks differs from that of the more commonly used recurrent multilayered perceptrons. Whether adaptive behavior is inherent to other types of RNN, therefore, remains an unresolved theoretical issue. In spite of plausibility arguments given by several authors (Feldkamp & Puskorius, 1997; Prokhorov et al., 2002), no formal proof has been made available, to the best of our knowledge.

In this paper we consider adaptive behavior in fixed-weight RNNs from the standpoint of their ability to *classify temporal signals* adaptively. We provide a formal proof that *continuous-time* recurrent neural networks with fixed weighs can successfully classify and recognize nonlinear functions of time and unknown parameter. These functions are allowed to be nonlinearly parameterized. The main idea behind our results consists of presenting a prototype dynamical system which solves the recognition problem. This is followed by a proof that a RNN with fixed weights can realize this system. We construct such a system using the concepts of relaxation times and weakly attracting sets (Milnor, 1985; Gorban, 2004) as well as the tests for convergence to such sets obtained in our earlier work (Tyukin et al., 2007). To show that our system can indeed be realized by a RNN with fixed weights we employ classical results on function approximation by feed-forward networks (Cybenko, 1989).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes notational agreements. In Section 3 we provide a mathematical statement of the problem, Section 4 contains the main results, and Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Notational Preliminaries

• Symbol $\mathbb{R}$ defines the field of real numbers, and symbol $\mathbb{R}_{\geq c}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ stands for the following set $\mathbb{R}_{\geq c} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x \geq c\}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{>c} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x > c\}$.

• Symbol $\mathbb{R}^n$ stands for an n-dimensional linear space over the field of reals.

• $\mathcal{C}^k$ denotes the space of functions that are at least k times differentiable.

• Symbol $\mathcal{K}$ denotes the class of all strictly increasing functions $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\kappa(0) = 0$; symbol $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ denotes the class of all functions $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\lim_{s\to\infty} \kappa(s) = \infty$.

• Symbol $\oplus$ denotes concatenation of two vectors.

• The solution of a system of differential equations $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(t, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}(t))$, $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{C}^0$, $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^m$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ passing through point $\mathbf{x}_0$ at $t = t_0$ will be denoted for $t \geq t_0$

as $\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{x}_0, t_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$, or simply as $\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{x}_0)$ or $\mathbf{x}(t)$ if it is clear from the context what the values of $\mathbf{x}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}$ are and how the function $\mathbf{u}(t)$ is defined.

• By $L^n_\infty[t_0, T]$, $t_0 \geq 0$, $T \geq t_0$ we denote the space of all functions $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\infty,[t_0,T]} = \operatorname{ess\,sup}\{\|\mathbf{f}(t)\|, t \in [t_0, T]\} < \infty$; $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\infty,[t_0,T]}$ stands for the $L^n_\infty[t_0, T]$ norm of $\mathbf{f}(t)$.

• Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\|\cdot\|$ be the usual Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By the symbol $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{A}}$ we denote the following induced norm:

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{A}} = \inf_{\mathbf{q}\in\mathcal{A}}\{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}\|\}$$

In case x is a scalar and $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, notation $\|x\|_\Delta$ stands for the following

$$\|x\|_\Delta = \begin{cases} |x| - \Delta, & |x| > \Delta \\ 0, & |x| \leq \Delta \end{cases}$$

3 Problem Formulation

Consider the following set of signals

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{F} = \{f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)\},\ i \in \{1, \ldots, N_f\}, \\ &f_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R},\ f_i(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^0, \\ &\xi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R},\ \xi(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^1 \cap L_\infty[0, \infty] \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta \subset \mathbb{R}$ are parameters of which the values are unknown a-priori, $\Omega_\theta = [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ is a bounded interval, and $\xi(t)$ is a known and bounded function. Signals $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ represent relevant physical variables of an object.

For the given functions $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ and $\xi(t)$ we say that θ_i is *equivalent* to θ'_i iff

$$f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) = f_i(\xi(t), \theta'_i)\ \forall\ t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \tag{2}$$

Hence an equivalence class for $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$ can be defined as

$$E_i(\theta_i) = \{\theta'_i \in \mathbb{R} |\ f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) = f_i(\xi(t), \theta'_i)\ \forall\ t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} \tag{3}$$

Equivalence classes (3) determine sets of indistinguishable parameterizations of the i-th signal. It is natural, therefore, to restrict ourselves to the problem of recognizing signals (1) up to their equivalence classes.

With respect to the equivalence classes $E_i(\theta_i)$, we further assume that there is at least one point $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|\theta_0\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} \geq \Delta_\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\ \forall\ \theta_i \in \Omega_\theta. \tag{4}$$

Requirement (4) is a technical assumption. It holds, however, for a wide range of practically relevant situations in which the union of $E_i(\theta_i)$ for all i and θ_i belongs to an interval of $\mathbb{R}$.

Furthermore, it allows us to exclude from consideration pathological cases in which almost all points in Ω_θ are indistinguishable in the sense of condition (2).

In many systems, artificial or natural, measured physical quantities, represented here by signals $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$, are often unavailable. This is because a measurement device is involved in measuring $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$. Given that signals $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ are functions of time, inherent dynamical properties of a measurement device would distort the measured values. Our present study takes this possibility into account. To do so we consider the case where signals $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ are affected by additive bounded noise and pass through nonlinear filters with uncertain dynamics. In particular, we assume that instead of functions $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ we access variables $s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$, which are solutions to the following ordinary differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{s}_i &= -\varphi_i(s_i) + f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) + \eta_i(t), \\ s_i(t_0) &= s_{i,0},\ s_{i,0} \in \Omega_s \subset \mathbb{R} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In (5) the function $\eta_i : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\eta_i(t) \in L_\infty[0, \infty],\ \|\eta_i(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq \Delta_\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \tag{6}$$

corresponds to measurement noise. The value of Δ_η in (5) is supposed to be known, while the values of initial conditions $s_i(t_0)$ and functions $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R},\ \varphi(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^1$ in (5) are assumed to be uncertain. We do, however, require that $\Omega_s = [s_{\min}, s_{\max}]$ is an interval and that the functions $\varphi_i(s_i)$ satisfy the following constraint:

$$\forall s_i \in \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow\ \varphi_{\min} \leq \frac{\partial \varphi_i(s_i)}{\partial s_i} \leq \varphi_{\max},\ \varphi_{\min}, \varphi_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \tag{7}$$

Condition (7) ensures that filters (5) are convergent (Pavlov, 2004), e.g. the dynamics of each variable $s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$ at $t \to \infty$ is uniquely determined in the absence of noise by $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$, and the effects of initial conditions $s_{i,0}$ vanish with time asymptotically.

A recurrent neural network is defined by the following set of differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_j &= \sum_{m=1}^{N} c_{j,m} \sigma(\mathbf{w}_{j,m}^T(\xi(t) \oplus s(t) \oplus \mathbf{x}) + b_{j,m}),\ j \in \{1, \ldots, N_x\}, \\ \mathbf{x} &= \mathrm{col}(x_1, \ldots, x_{N_x}),\ \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where functions $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are sigmoid. Vectors $\mathbf{c}_j = \mathrm{col}(c_{j,1}, \ldots, c_{j,N})$, $\mathbf{b}_j = \mathrm{col}(b_{j,1}, \ldots, b_{j,N})$ and matrices $\boldsymbol{W}_j = (\mathbf{w}_{j,1}, \ldots, \mathbf{w}_{j,N})$ are the RNN parameters. Functions $\xi(t),\ s(t) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\xi(t), s(t) \in \mathcal{C}^0$ are inputs; $\mathbf{x}$ is the state vector, and $\mathbf{x}_0$ is a vector of initial conditions.

According to notation (8) the network maps two functions of time $\xi(t)$, $s(t)$ into the functions $x_1(t, \mathbf{x}_0), \ldots, x_{N_x}(t, \mathbf{x}_0)$, which are the solutions of (8). In what follows we will consider variables $\xi(t)$, $s(t)$ as inputs to the network. While the variable $\xi(t)$ is known a-priori, variable $s(t)$ is

allowed to vary within the set of functions $s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$, which are the solutions of (5). In particular, we assume that the following condition is satisfied:

Assumption 1 (Existence) *There exist $i \in N_f$, $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$, $s_{i,0} \in \Omega_s$ and $\eta_i(t)$ specified by (6) such that*

$$s(t) = s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t)) \ \forall \ t \geq 0. \tag{9}$$

We aim to determine if there is a network of type (8) which is able to recover uncertain parameters i and θ_i from the input $s(t)$[1], $t \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ within a finite interval of time for all $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Informally, this means that there exist two sets of functions of network state $\mathbf{x}$ and input $s(t)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\{h_{f,j}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))\}, \ \{h_{\theta,j}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))\}, \\ &h_{f,j} : \mathbb{R}^{N_x} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \ h_{\theta,j} : \mathbb{R}^{N_x} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \ j \in \{1, \ldots, N_f\}, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

such that the values of i and θ_i can be inferred from $\{h_{f,j}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))\}$, $\{h_{\theta,j}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))\}$ respectively within a given finite interval of time. Formally we can state this as follows:

Problem 1 *Consider class $\mathcal{F}$ of signals (1), where the function $\xi(t)$ is known, and the values of parameters θ_i are unknown a-priori. Determine a recurrent neural network (8) such that the following properties hold:*

1) there is a set of initial conditions Ω_x such that $\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{x}_0)$ is bounded for all $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_x$ and $t \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$; the volume of Ω_x is nonzero;

2) there exists a set of output functions (10) such that, for all $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$, $s_{i,0} \in \Omega_s$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \Omega_x$, and functions $\eta_i(t)$ given by (6), condition (9) implies existence of a constant $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, time instant $t' \in (t_0, t_0 + \mathcal{T})$, (arbitrarily large) $T^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and (arbitrarily small) $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|h_{f,i}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))\|_{\infty,[t',t'+T^*]} < \varepsilon + \mathcal{D}(\Delta_\eta), \\ &\inf_{\theta_i' \in E(\theta_i)} \|h_{\theta,i}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t)) - \theta_i'\|_{\infty,[t',t'+T^*]} < \varepsilon + \mathcal{D}(\Delta_\eta). \end{aligned}$$

In general, this problem has no solutions for all possible $\xi(t) \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and $f_i(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^0$. Consider, for instance, the case when $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) = \sin(\xi(t)\theta_i)$ and

$$\xi(t) = \begin{cases} \sin^2(\ln(t - t_0 + 1)), & \sin(\ln(t - t_0 + 1)) \geq 0 \\ 0, & \sin(\ln(t - t_0 + 1)) < 0 \end{cases} \quad \forall \ t \geq t_0.$$

Time intervals when $\xi(t) = 0$ are growing unboundedly with time. Hence for any fixed $\mathcal{T}$, T^* there will always exist an instant t_0' such that for all $t \geq t_0'$ the lengths of intervals when $\xi(t) = 0$

[1]Because filters (5) are convergent, the effect of uncertainty in parameter $s_{i,0}$ vanishes with time exponentially. Hence the only effective uncertainties are i and θ_i.

exceed $\mathcal{T} + T^*$. For all such intervals, solutions $s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$ do not depend on θ_i. Hence recovery of the actual values of θ_i from signal $s(t)$ cannot be achieved within a fixed time interval $[t_0, t_0 + \mathcal{T} + T^*]$ for all $t_0 \geq t_0'$. In order to enable a solution of the classification/recognition problem above we must introduce an additional constraint on the functions $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$. This should ensure that variation in parameter θ_i can be detected from the values of $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ within a finite time interval. We therefore require that the following property holds:

Assumption 2 (Non-degeneracy) *For the set of functions $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ specified by (1) and all $t \geq t_0$, θ_i, θ_i' there exist a constant $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and a strictly increasing function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that the following condition holds:*

$$\forall\ t \geq t_0\ \exists\ t' \in [t, t+T] : \quad |f_i(\xi(t'), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t'), \theta_i')| \geq \rho\left(\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\theta_i')}\right). \tag{11}$$

In case the equivalence classes $E_i(\theta_i')$ consist of single elements, e.g. when there is a unique value of $\theta_i' = \theta_i$ satisfying (2), condition (11) will have a more transparent form:

$$\forall\ t \geq t_0\ \exists\ t' \in [t, t+T] : \quad |f_i(\xi(t'), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t'), \theta_i')| \geq \rho(|\theta_i - \theta_i'|). \tag{12}$$

These conditions simply state that within a fixed time interval the values of $\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\theta_i')}$ or $|\theta_i - \theta_i'|$ can be inferred from the differences $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i')$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

In the next section we show that the solution to Problem 1 can be obtained for the class $\mathcal{F}$ of functions $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ that are Lipschitz in θ_i. We present these results in the form of sufficient conditions formulated in Theorem 1.

4 Main Results

As was suggested in our previous work (Prokhorov et al., 2002), as well as in (Younger et al., 1999) the reason why RNNs with fixed parameters (weights) demonstrate adaptive behavior could be found in their dynamics; supposedly, it is already sufficiently rich to have an adequate adaptation mechanism embedded into it. Finding a system which satisfies requirements 1), 2) in Problem 1 and which is, at the same time, realizable by a RNN, therefore, automatically constitutes an existence proof. This intuition, we will show, is correct. The result is provided in Theorem 1 below.

Theorem 1 (Existence) *Let functions $\xi(t)$, $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ be given and defined as in (1), and Assumptions 1, 2 hold. Furthermore, suppose that $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ are (locally) Lipschitz[2]:*

$$\exists\ D_\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} : \ |f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i')| \leq D_\theta \|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\theta_i')} \qquad \forall\ t > 0,\ \theta_i, \theta_i' \tag{13}$$

$$\exists\ D_\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} : \ |f_i(\xi, \theta_i) - f_i(\xi', \theta_i)| \leq D_\xi |\xi - \xi'| \qquad \forall\ \theta_i, \xi, \xi' \tag{14}$$

[2]Property (13) can be understood as a generalized Lipschitz condition. When equivalence sets $E_i(\theta_i')$ consist of single elements the property transforms into: $|f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i')| \leq D_\theta |\theta_i - \theta_i'|$.

and the time-derivative of $\xi(t)$ is bounded:

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}\xi(t)\right| \leq \partial\xi_\infty \ \forall\ t \geq 0. \tag{15}$$

Then for any $T^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ there is a recurrent neural network (8) satisfying the requirements of Problem 1, provided that the upper bound Δ_η for the $L_\infty[0,\infty]$-norms of the disturbance terms, $\eta_i(t)$, is sufficiently small.

Proof of Theorem 1. We prove the theorem in four steps. First, we present a dynamical system which will be referred to as the *convergence prototype*. We select this system in the following class of differential-algebraic equations:

$$\dot{\hat{s}}_i = -\varphi_i(\hat{s}_i) + f_i(\xi(t), \hat{\theta}_i) \tag{16}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_i = a + \frac{b-a}{2}(x_i + 1) \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= \gamma\|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon \left(x_i - y_i - x_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)\right) \\ \dot{y}_i &= \gamma\|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon \left(x_i + y_i - y_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where

$$\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0},\ a, b \in \mathbb{R},\ a < \theta_{\min},\ b > \theta_{\max},\ \theta_0 \in [a,b],\ i = 1, \ldots, N_f,\ \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \tag{19}$$

System (16)–(18) has a locally Lipschitz right-hand side and its solutions are bounded for all initial conditions $\hat{s}_i(t_0)$, $x_i(t_0)$, $y_i(t_0) \in \mathbb{R}$. We show that there exist (domains of) $\gamma > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and a point $\hat{s}_i(t_0) = s_0'$, $x_i(t_0) = x_0'$, $y_i(t_0) = y_0'$, such that the trajectories passing through this point converge to the following target set

$$\|\hat{s}_i - s_i\|_\varepsilon = 0, \quad \left\|\hat{\theta}_i\right\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} \leq \varepsilon_\theta(\varepsilon). \tag{20}$$

Second, we prove that there is a point $x_i(t_0) = x_0'$, $y_i(t_0) = y_0'$ such that convergence is locally uniform with respect to the values of uncertain θ_i and $s_{i,0}$. In other words, for all $t_0 \geq 0$, $s_{i,0} \in \Omega_s$, and $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$ there exists $\tau > 0$ such that solutions of (16)–(18) with initial conditions $x_i(t_0) = x_0'$, $y_i(t_0) = y_0'$ will be in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of (20) for all $t \geq t_0 + \tau$.

System (16)–(18), however, is not structurally stable. That is, small perturbations of its right-hand side might change asymptotic properties of the system drastically. Hence, due to the inevitable approximation errors, the chances that an RNN realization of (16)–(18) would solve Problem 1 are slim. To continue our argument we need to modify (16)–(18) such that the resulting system becomes structurally stable.

For this reason we, third, consider the perturbed version of system (16)–(18)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dot{\hat{s}}_i = -\varphi_i(\hat{s}_i) + f_i(\xi(t), \hat{\theta}_i) \\
&\hat{\theta}_i = a + \frac{b-a}{2}(x_i + 1)
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dot{x}_i = \gamma(\|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon + \delta)\left(x_i - y_i - x_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)\right) \\
&\dot{y}_i = \gamma(\|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon + \delta)\left(x_i + y_i - y_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)\right),\ \delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

aiming at achieving structural stability of an otherwise structurally unstable system. We show that trajectories of system (21), (22) periodically visit a small vicinity of (20) and stay there for an arbitrary long time, depending on the value of δ. Fourth, given that system (21), (22) is structurally stable, we apply the results from (Cybenko, 1989) to demonstrate that solutions of (21), (22) can be approximated in forward time over the semi-infinite interval $[0, \infty]$ by the state of a recurrent neural network specified by equations (8).

1. Convergence prototype. According to Assumption 1 there exist $i \in \{1, \ldots, N_f\}$, $s_{i,0}$, θ_i such that $s(t) = s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$ for all $t \geq 0$. Consider the i-th subsystem of (16)–(18) and analyze the dynamics of the following difference: $s_i(t) - \hat{s}_i(t)$. Denoting

$$\begin{aligned}
e_i(t) &= s(t) - \hat{s}_i(t) = s_i(t) - \hat{s}_i(t), \\
\alpha_i(t) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial \varphi(s_i(t)r + (1-r)\hat{s}_i(t))}{\partial s_i(t)r + (1-r)\hat{s}_i(t))} dr \\
\Delta f_i(t) &= f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t), \hat{\theta}_i(x_i(t)))
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

and using Hadamard's lemma we can derive the following estimate:

$$|e_i(t)| \leq e^{-\int_0^t \alpha_i(\tau)d\tau}|e_i(0)| + \frac{1}{\varphi_{\min}}\left(1 - e^{-\int_0^t \alpha_i(\tau)d\tau}\right)\left(\|\Delta f_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,t]} + \|\eta_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}\right) \tag{24}$$

Given that $\|\eta_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq \Delta_\eta$ for all $t \geq 0$, inequality (24) implies that

$$\left(|e_i(t)| - \frac{\Delta_\eta}{\varphi_{\min}}\right) \leq e^{-\varphi_{\min} t}\left(|e_i(0)| - \frac{\Delta_\eta}{\varphi_{\min}}\right) + \frac{1}{\varphi_{\min}}\|\Delta f_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,t]}$$

Hence the following estimate holds along the trajectories of (16):

$$\|e_i(t)\|_\varepsilon \leq e^{-\varphi_{\min} t}\|e_i(0)\|_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varphi_{\min}}\|\Delta f_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,t]}, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{\Delta_\eta}{\varphi_{\min}} \tag{25}$$

Taking (13), (25) into account plus the fact that $\left\|\hat{\theta}_i\right\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} = \inf_{\bar{\theta}_i \in E_i(\theta_i)} |\hat{\theta}_i - \bar{\theta}_i|$ we can conclude that the following inequality holds:

$$\|e_i(t)\|_\varepsilon \leq e^{-\varphi_{\min} t}\|e_i(0)\|_\varepsilon + \frac{D_\theta}{\varphi_{\min}}\|\bar{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,t]},\ \bar{\theta}_i \in E_i(\theta_i) \cap [a, b]. \tag{26}$$

Let us now consider equations (17), (18). We pick up a point x', y' which satisfies the following condition:

$$x'^2 + y'^2 = 1. \tag{27}$$

Solutions of (18) passing through this point can be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(t,x',y') &= \cos\left(\int_0^t \gamma\|\hat{s}_i(\tau)-s(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau+\nu_x\right),\ x'=\cos(\nu_x),\ \nu_x\in[0,2\pi] \\ y_i(t,x',y') &= \sin\left(\int_0^t \gamma\|\hat{s}_i(\tau)-s(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau+\nu_y\right),\ y'=\sin(\nu_y),\ \nu_y\in[0,2\pi] \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

This can be easily verified when writing (18) in the system of polar coordinates: $x_i = r\cos(\nu)$, $y_i = r\sin(\nu)$ (Guckenheimer & Holmes, 2002):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r} &= \gamma\|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon \cdot r(1-r) \\ \dot{\nu} &= \gamma\|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon \cdot 1 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Given that $\bar{\theta}_i$ belongs to the interval $[a,b]$, there is a number $\bar{h}(\bar{\theta}_i)\in[0,\pi]$ such that for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ the following equivalence holds

$$\bar{\theta}_i = a + \frac{b-a}{2}\left(\cos(\bar{h}(\bar{\theta}_i)+2\pi k)+1\right). \tag{30}$$

Hence according to (17), (28) the norm $\|\bar{\theta}_i-\hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,t]}$ can be estimated from above as follows:

$$\|\bar{\theta}_i-\hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,t]} \le \frac{b-a}{2}\|\bar{h}(\bar{\theta}_i)-\nu_x+2\pi k-\int_0^t \gamma\|\hat{s}_i(\tau)-s(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau\|_{\infty,[0,t]} \tag{31}$$

Denoting

$$c=\frac{D_\theta}{\varphi_{\min}}\frac{b-a}{2};\quad h(t,\bar{\theta}_i,k)=\bar{h}(\bar{\theta}_i)-\nu_x+2\pi k-\int_0^t \gamma\|\hat{s}_i(\tau)-s(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau$$

and taking into account (26), (31) we can conclude that the following holds along the solutions of (16)–(18):

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_i(t)\|_\varepsilon &\le e^{-\varphi_{\min}t}\|e_i(0)\|_\varepsilon + c\|h(\tau,\bar{\theta}_i,k)\|_{\infty,[0,t]}; \\ h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k)-h(t,\bar{\theta}_i,k) &= \int_0^t \gamma\|e_i(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

According to (Tyukin et al., 2007) (Theorem 1 and Corollaries 2, 3) there exist $\gamma^*\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and h^* such that for a given bounded $e_i(0)$, all $\gamma\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\gamma<\gamma^*$ and $h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k)\ge h^*$ the norm $\|e_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}$ is bounded and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t,\bar{\theta}_i,k)\in[0,h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k)]. \tag{33}$$

The value of γ^*, according to Corollary 3 in (Tyukin et al., 2007), can be determined from the following inequality

$$0<\gamma^*<\frac{\varphi_{\min}}{c}\left(\ln\left(\frac{\kappa}{d}\right)\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}\left(2+\frac{\kappa}{1-d}\right)\right)^{-1},\ \kappa\in\mathbb{R}_{>1},\ d\in(0,1)\subset\mathbb{R}. \tag{34}$$

The value of h^* can be estimated from:

$$\|e_i(t_0)\|_\varepsilon \leq \left(\frac{\varphi_{\min}}{\gamma^*}\left(\ln\frac{\kappa}{d}\right)^{-1}\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa} - c\left(2+\frac{\kappa}{1-d}\right)\right)h^* \tag{35}$$

Given that $\|e_i(t_0)\|_\varepsilon$ in (35) is bounded from above for all $t_0 \geq 0$, $\|e_i(t_0)\|_\varepsilon \leq s_{\max} - s_{\min} + D_\theta/\varphi_{\min}(b-a)$, condition

$$h^* \geq \left((s_{\max}-s_{\min}) + \frac{D_\theta(b-a)}{\varphi_{\min}}\right)\left(\frac{\varphi_{\min}}{\gamma^*}\left(\ln\frac{\kappa}{d}\right)^{-1}\frac{\kappa-1}{\kappa} - c\left(2+\frac{\kappa}{1-d}\right)\right)^{-1} \tag{36}$$

together with (34) imply that for all $\hat{s}_i(t_0) \in \Omega_s$ and $h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k) \geq h^*$ the norm $\|e_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}$ is bounded and property (33) holds.

Notice that in the definition of $h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k)$:

$$h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k) = \bar{h}(\bar{\theta}_i) - \nu_x + 2\pi k \tag{37}$$

the value of k can be chosen arbitrarily large. Moreover, $\bar{h}(\bar{\theta}_i) \in [0,\pi]$ for all $\bar{\theta}_i \in [a,b]$. This implies that there exists a finite k' such that condition $h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k') \geq h^*$ will be satisfied for any fixed h^* (i.e. for all γ^* satisfying (34)) and all $\bar{\theta}_i \in [a,b]$. In addition, the following will hold:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t,\bar{\theta}_i,k') \in [0, h(0,\bar{\theta}_i,k')] \subset [0, \pi - \nu_x + 2\pi k'] \;\; \forall \in \bar{\theta}_i \in [a,b]. \tag{38}$$

Taking (28) into account we can conclude that solutions $x_i(t,x',y')$ converge to a point in the interval $[-1,1]$ as $t\to\infty$, and vector $(x_i(t,x',y'),y_i(t,x',y'))$ makes no more than k' full rotations around the origin for all $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min},\theta_{\max}]$. Hence for a given initial condition $x_i(0)=x'$, $y_i(0)=y'$, $\hat{s}_{i,0}\in\Omega_s$ and $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min},\theta_{\max}]$ the estimate $\hat{\theta}_i(t) = a + (b-a)/2\cdot(x_i(t,x',y')+1)$ converges to a point in $[a,b]$ as $t\to\infty$. We denote this point by symbol $\hat{\theta}_i^*$.

Given that $\hat{\theta}_i(t)$ converges to a limit, there exists a time instant t^* such that for all $t\geq t^*$ the following condition holds: $|\hat{\theta}_i(t) - \hat{\theta}_i^*| < \mu_\infty$, where $\mu_\infty \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is an arbitrarily small constant. Therefore, taking condition (13) into account, we can conclude that for all $t\geq t^*$ derivative $\dot{e}_i$ satisfies the following equation:

$$\dot{e}_i = -\alpha(t)e_i + f_i(\xi(t),\theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t),\hat{\theta}_i^*) + \mu_i(t) + \eta_i(t) \tag{39}$$

where $|\mu_i(t)| \leq D_\theta\,\mu_\infty$ is a continuous function.

Now we will show that the norm $\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)}$ can be bounded from above by a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$-function of Δ_η. Consider the term $f_i(\xi(t),\theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t),\hat{\theta}_i^*)$. According to (11) there exists a sequence of monotonically increasing time instances t_j, $j=1,2,\ldots$ such that $t_{j+1}-t_j \leq 2T$ and $|f_i(\xi(t_j),\theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t_j),\hat{\theta}_i^*)| \geq \rho(\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)})$. Furthermore, according to (14), (15), the time-derivative of $f_i(\xi(t),\theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t),\hat{\theta}_i^*)$ is bounded:

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}f_i(\xi(t),\theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t),\hat{\theta}_i^*)\right| \leq 2D_\xi\cdot\partial\xi_\infty = D_f$$

Hence the following estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_t^{t+L} |f_i(\xi(\tau),\theta_i) - f_i(\xi(\tau),\hat{\theta}_i^*)| \geq \frac{\rho(\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)})^2}{2D_f} \\ &L = \max\left\{2T, \frac{\rho(b-a)}{D_f}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

In order to proceed further we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 1 *Consider the following differential equation*

$$\dot{z} = -\varphi(t,z) + u(t) + \eta(t),\ z_0 = z(0) \in [z_{\min}, z_{\max}] \subset \mathbb{R} \tag{41}$$

Let us suppose that

1) $\varphi(z)z \geq 0,\ \varphi_{\min} \leq \partial\varphi(t,z)/\partial z \leq \varphi_{\max}$*;*

2) $u(t) \in L_\infty[0,\infty] \cap \mathcal{C}^1,\ \|u(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq u_\infty,\ \|\dot{u}(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq \partial u_\infty$

3) $\eta(t) \in L_\infty[0,\infty],\ \|\eta(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq \Delta$

4) there exist constants L, δ *such that for all* $t \geq 0$

$$\int_t^{t+L} |u(\tau)|d\tau \geq \delta \tag{42}$$

5) finally assume that the following inequality holds

$$\left(\frac{\delta}{L}\right)^2 - \Delta u_\infty > 0. \tag{43}$$

Then for any $p \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ *there exist constants* $L^* > 0$ *and* $\delta^* \geq ((\delta/L)^2 - \Delta u_\infty)/p$*, such that*

$$\int_t^{t+L^*} |z(\tau)|d\tau \geq \delta^* \geq \frac{1}{p}\left(\frac{\delta^2}{L} - \Delta u_\infty L\right)\ \forall\ t \geq 0 \tag{44}$$

Proof of Lemma 1. We prove the lemma along the lines of an argument provided in (Loria et al., 2003) (Property 1). Consider the time-derivative of zu:

$$\frac{d}{dt}(zu) = (-\varphi(t,z) + u + \eta)u + z\dot{u} \geq u^2 - |z|(\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty) - |u|\Delta \tag{45}$$

According to (45) for all $t, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $t \geq t_0$ the following inequality holds:

$$z(t)u(t) - z(t_0)u(t_0) \geq \int_{t_0}^t u^2(\tau)d\tau - (\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty)\int_{t_0}^t |z(\tau)|d\tau - \Delta\int_{t_0}^t |u(\tau)|d\tau \tag{46}$$

Rearranging terms in (46) yields

$$(\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty)\int_{t_0}^t |z(\tau)|d\tau \geq z(t_0)u(t_0) - z(t)u(t) + \int_{t_0}^t u^2(\tau)d\tau - \Delta\int_{t_0}^t |u(\tau)|d\tau$$

Notice that $z(t_0)u(t_0) - z(t)u(t)$ is bounded from below for all $t \geq 0$. We denote this bound by symbol M. Furthermore, according to the Holder inequality and property (42), the following estimate holds for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\frac{\delta^2}{L} \leq \frac{1}{L}\left(\int_t^{t+L} |u(\tau)|d\tau\right)^2 \leq \int_t^{t+L} u^2(\tau)d\tau.$$

Hence for all time instances t: $(n+1)L \geq t - t_0 \geq nL$, where n is a positive integer, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty)\int_{t_0}^{t} |z(\tau)|d\tau &\geq M + n\frac{\delta^2}{L} - \Delta\int_{t_0}^{t}|u(\tau)|d\tau \\ &\geq M + n\frac{\delta^2}{L} - (n+1)\Delta u_\infty = (M - \Delta u_\infty L) + n\left(\frac{\delta^2}{L} - \Delta u_\infty L\right)\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

According to the requirements of the lemma, inequality (43), the difference $\delta^2/L - \Delta u_\infty L > 0$ is a positive constant. Therefore, there exists $n = n'$ such that the right-hand side of (47) exceeds some $\delta' = (\delta^2/L - \Delta u_\infty L)/p' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $p' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Choosing $t' = \min_t\{t - t_0\} \geq n'L$ we can conclude that

$$(\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty)\int_{t_0}^{t'} |z(\tau)|d\tau \geq \delta' \tag{48}$$

Given that we could chose the value of t_0 arbitrarily in the domain $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, inequality (48) is equivalent to

$$\int_t^{t+L^*} |z(\tau)|d\tau \geq \delta^*,$$

where $L^* = t' - t_0$, $\delta^* = \delta'/(\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty) = (\delta^2/L - \Delta u_\infty L)/p$, $p = p'(\varphi_{\max} + \partial u_\infty)$. *The lemma is proven.*

Denoting $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i) - f_i(\xi(t), \hat{\theta}_i^*) = u(t)$, $\eta_i(t) + \mu_i(t) = \eta(t)$ we can observe that equation (39) is of the same class as (41) in the formulation of Lemma 1. Furthermore, the following inequalities hold:

$$\Delta \leq \Delta_\eta + D_\theta\ \mu_\infty; \quad \|u(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq D_\theta \|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)} \leq D_\theta(b-a) \tag{49}$$

Notice that the value of μ_∞ in (49) can be made arbitrarily small because $\hat{\theta}_i(t)$ converges to a limit, and $\hat{\theta}_i^*$ can be chosen from its arbitrarily small vicinity. Let us therefore chose $\hat{\theta}_i^*$ such that $D_\theta\mu_\infty \leq \Delta_\eta$. Hence, in accordance with Lemma 1, condition

$$\left(\frac{\rho^2(\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)})}{2D_f L}\right)^2 > 2\Delta_\eta D_\theta(b-a) \tag{50}$$

implies existence of constants L^*, $p \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$\int_t^{t+L^*} |e_i(\tau)|d\tau \geq \frac{1}{p}\left(\left(\frac{\rho^2(\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)})}{2D_f}\right)^2 \frac{1}{L} - \Delta u_\infty L\right) = \delta^* > 0 \ \ \forall t \geq t^*. \tag{51}$$

We are going to show now that the norm $\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)}$ is bounded from above by a function $\varepsilon_\theta(\Delta_\eta) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ for all sufficiently small Δ_η. Let us parameterize Δ_η as follows:

$$\Delta_\eta = \left(\frac{\rho^2(\varepsilon^*)}{2D_f L}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2D_\theta(b-a)},\ \varepsilon^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \tag{52}$$

Parametrization (52) is always possible because $\rho(\cdot) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. For all $\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)} > \varepsilon^*$ condition (50) is satisfied. Hence, according to Lemma 1 there exist constants L^*, p such that inequality (51) holds. Given that $\delta^*,\ L^*,\ \varphi_{\min} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ there will always exist a number $\Delta_\eta^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\Delta_\eta^* < (L^*)^{-1}\delta^*\varphi_{\min}/2$. This implies that for all $\Delta_\eta \leq \Delta_\eta^*$ the following inequality holds

$$\int_t^{t+L^*} \|e_i(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau \geq \frac{\delta^*}{2},\ \varepsilon = \frac{\Delta_\eta}{\varphi_{\min}}. \tag{53}$$

Let us suppose that the norm $\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)}$ is greater than ε^*. In this case (50), (53) hold and the integral

$$\int_{t^*}^{t} \|e_i(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau \tag{54}$$

grows unboundedly with t. On the other hand, according to (32), (33) integral (54) is bounded. Hence we have reached a contradiction. This implies that $\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)} \leq \varepsilon^*$. Given that $\rho(\cdot) \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, the inverse $\rho^{-1}(\cdot)$ is well defined and is a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$-function. Therefore, taking (52) into account, we can conclude that the latter inequality is equivalent to:

$$\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i^*)} \leq \rho^{-1}\left(\left(8\Delta_\eta D_\theta(b-a)D_f^2L^2\right)^{1/4}\right) \tag{55}$$

Thus we have just shown that there exists a point x', y' in system (16)–(18), and parameters γ and ε such that the system trajectories starting from this point converge into a small neighborhood of $E_i(\theta_i)$ in finite time for all $s_{i,0} \in \Omega_s$ and any given $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$. The size of this neighborhood can be characterized by a $\mathcal{K}_\infty$-function of Δ_η, when Δ_η is sufficiently small. Let us now show that this convergence is uniform with respect to θ_i.

2. Uniformity. Consider equation (38). According to (32), (38) trajectories passing through a point (x', y') satisfying (27) at $t = 0$ also satisfy the following constraint:

$$\exists k' \in \mathbb{Z}:\quad h(0) - h(\infty) = \gamma \int_0^\infty \|e_i(\tau, e_i(0), \theta_i, \eta_i(\tau))\|_\varepsilon d\tau \leq \pi - \nu_x + 2\pi k' < \infty \tag{56}$$

for all $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ and $e_i(0)$. We will use this property to demonstrate that there is a point (x', y'), $\sqrt{x'^2 + y'^2} = 1$, $\|\hat{\theta}_i(x')\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} \geq \Delta_0$, $\Delta_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, such that for any $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ the estimate $\hat{\theta}_i(x_i(t, x', y'))$ converges into a set

$$\|\theta_i\|_{E_i(\hat{\theta}_i)} \leq \rho^{-1}\left(\left(8\Delta_\eta D_\theta(b-a)D_f^2L^2\right)^{1/4}\right) \tag{57}$$

in finite time $T'(\theta_i)$ for all $t_0,\ \hat{s}_{i,0} \in \Omega_s$, and stays there for all $t \geq t_0 + T'(\theta_i)$. Furthermore, the value of $T'(\theta_i)$ is bounded from above for all $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$. In other words, there exists $T'_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$T'(\theta_i) \leq T'_{\max}\ \forall\ \theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]. \tag{58}$$

The fact that estimate $\hat{\theta}_i$ converges into a set specified by (57) in finite time $T'(\theta_i)$ and stays there for $t \geq t_0 + T'(\theta_i)$ for all $x',\ y' :\ \sqrt{x'^2 + y'^2} = 1$ follows immediately from (55). We must show, however, that (58) holds.

According to (4), (19) there is a point $\theta_0 \in [a, b]$ such that $\|\theta_0\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} \geq \Delta_\theta$ for every $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$. Hence, there exists a point $\theta_{i,1} \in [a, b]$ such that

$$\inf_{\bar{\theta}_i \in E_i(\theta_i) \cap [a,b]} \|\bar{\theta}_i - \theta_{i,1}\| = \Delta_\theta$$

Without loss of generality, suppose that the set $\Omega_1 = \{\bar{\theta}_i \in E_i(\theta_i) \cap [a, b] |\ \theta_{i,1} > \bar{\theta}_i\}$ is not empty[3]. By symbol $\theta_{i,\max}$ we denote $\theta_{i,\max} = \sup\{\Omega_1\}$. Let us pick a point $\theta_{i,2} \in [a, b]$ according to the following constraints

$$\begin{gathered} |\theta_{i,2} - \theta_{i,1}| = |\theta_{i,2} - \theta_{i,\max}| = \Delta_\theta/2, \\ \theta_{i,1} > \theta_{i,2} > \theta_{i,\max}, \end{gathered} \tag{59}$$

and choose the value of ν_x in (28) such that

$$\theta_{i,2} = a + \frac{b-a}{2}(\cos(\nu_x) + 1),\ \nu_x \in [0, \pi].$$

According to (30) there exist $\bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max})$, k such that

$$\theta_{i,\max} = a + \frac{b-a}{2}(\cos(\bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max}) + 2\pi k) + 1),\ \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max}) \in [0, \pi],\ k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Given that $\theta_{i,2} > \theta_{i,\max}$ we set the value of $k = 0$ and chose $\bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max})$ in accordance with the following inequality:

$$\nu_x < \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max}). \tag{60}$$

Because $|\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu_x)) - \hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu'_x))| \leq \frac{b-a}{2}|\nu_x - \nu'_x|$ for all $\nu_x, \nu'_x \in \mathbb{R}$, conditions (59), (60) ensure existence of a constant $\nu'_x \leq \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max})$, $\nu'_x = \nu_x + \Delta_\theta/(2(b-a))$ such that

$$|\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu_x)) - \hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu''_x))| \leq \Delta_\theta/4\ \ \forall\ \nu''_x \in [\nu_x, \nu'_x]. \tag{61}$$

Hence,

$$\|\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu''_x))\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} \geq \frac{\Delta_\theta}{4}\ \ \forall\ \nu''_x \in [\nu_x, \nu'_x].$$

[3]If Ω_1 is empty then $\Omega_2 = \{\bar{\theta}_i \in E_i(\theta_i) \cap [a, b] |\ \theta_{i,1} < \bar{\theta}_i\}$ is not empty. We can proceed with the same argument replacing interval $[0, \pi]$ with $[\pi, 2\pi]$ and sup with inf when appropriate.

The inequality above implies that the values of $\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu''_x))$ are outside of the $\Delta_\theta/4$-neighborhood of $E_i(\theta_i)$ for all $\nu''_x \in [\nu_x, \nu'_x]$. Furthermore, because $\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\cdot))$ is monotone (non-increasing) over $[\nu_x, \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max}))$, and $\theta_{i,2} > \theta_{i,\max}$, there are no values of $\nu''_x \in [\nu_x, \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max}))$ such that $\|\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu''_x))\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} = 0$.

Let us consider solutions of system (16)–(18) passing through the following point $x_i(0) = \cos(\nu_x)$, $y_i(0) = \sin(\nu_x)$, $\hat{s}_i(0) \in \Omega_s$. Suppose that $0 < \gamma < \gamma^*$, and γ^* satisfies (36) with $h^* = \Delta_\theta/(2(b-a))$. Then, according to (Tyukin et al., 2007) the sum $\nu_x + \gamma \int_0^t \|e_i(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau$ converges to a point in $[\nu_x, \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max})]$. Taking monotonicity and continuity of function $\hat{\theta}_i(\cos(\nu''_x))$ for $\nu''_x \in [\nu_x, \bar{h}(\theta_{i,\max})]$ into account, we can conclude that trajectory $\hat{\theta}_i(x_i(t, x'(\theta_i)))$ enters the ε^*-neighborhood of $\theta_{i,\max}$ only once for all $t \in [0, \infty]$.

Let us show that amount of time required for the system to enter this neighborhood is bounded from above for all $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$. Given that trajectory $\hat{\theta}_i(x_i(t, x', y'))$ enters the ε^*-neighborhood of $\theta_{i,\max}$ only once, we shall show that the amount of time the system spends outside of this neighborhood is bounded from above for all $\theta_i \in \Omega_\theta$. We prove this by contradiction. Suppose that for any fixed $T'_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ there is a $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ such that $T'(\theta_i) \geq T'_0$. Consider dynamics of (16)–(18) when $s(t) = s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$. Let us pick a sequence of time instances $\{t_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, such that $t_{j+1} - t_j = D_T$, and $D_T \geq L^*$. For each interval $[t_j, t_{j+1}]$ we consider two possibilities:

1) the norm $\|\hat{\theta}_i(t_j) - \hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} \leq \epsilon$, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\epsilon \leq D_\theta^{-1}\Delta_\eta$, and

2) the norm $\|\hat{\theta}_i(t_j) - \hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} > \epsilon$.

In case the first alternative applies, according to (53) the following estimate holds $\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \|e_i(\tau)\|_\varepsilon d\tau \geq \delta^*$. Hence $h(t_j) - h(t_{j+1}) > \gamma\delta^*$. When the second alternative holds, e.g. $\|\hat{\theta}_i(t_i) - \hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\|_{\infty,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} > \epsilon$, we can conclude, using inequality (31), that

$$\|\gamma \int_{t_j}^{\tau} \|e_i(\tau_1)\|_\varepsilon d\tau_1\|_{\infty,[t_j,t_{j+1}]} > \epsilon \frac{2}{b-a}.$$

Given that $h(t)$ is monotone with respect to t we obtain that $h(t_j) - h(t_{j+1}) > \epsilon 2/(b-a)$. Thus we have shown that

$$h(t_j) - h(t_{j+1}) > \min\{\gamma\delta^*, \epsilon 2/(b-a)\} = \Delta_h$$

for all j such that $\left\|\hat{\theta}_i(\tau)\right\|_{E_i(\theta_i)} \geq \varepsilon^*$ for all $\tau \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$. Given that $h(t)$ is non-increasing and T' is arbitrarily large, there will be a time instance $t_m \leq T'$ such that $\sum_j^m h(t_j) - h(t_{j+1}) \geq m\Delta_h > \pi - \nu_x + 2\pi k'$. This, however, contradicts to (56). Hence property (58) is proven.

3. Structurally stable prototype. So far we have shown that for the given system (16)–(18) there exists a non-empty set of parameters γ, ε, and $x', y' : \sqrt{x'^2 + y'^2} = 1$ such that trajectories $x_i(t, x', y')$, $y_i(t, x', y')$ converge to a point on the unit circle in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and variable $\hat{\theta}_i(x_i(t, x', y'))$ reaches a given small vicinity of $E_i(\theta_i)$ (see (57)) within finite time $T'_{\max}$ for all $\theta_i \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$.

Let us now consider perturbed system (21), (22) where $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and initial conditions are selected in a neighborhood of x', y':

$$(x_i(0), y_i(0)) \in \Omega(x', y') = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 | \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2} \leq \delta_r\},\ \delta_r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \tag{62}$$

In order to distinguish solutions of (21), (22) from the solutions of unperturbed system (16)–(18), we denote the latter by symbols $x_i^*(t, x_i(0), y_i(0))$, $y_i^*(t, x_i(0), y_i(0))$, and $\hat{s}_i^*(t, \theta_i, s_{i,0}, \eta_i(t))$. For the sake of notational compactness we also denote the state vector of the i-th subsystem of (16)–(18) as $\mathbf{q}_i^* = (\hat{s}_i^*, x_i^*, y_i^*)$, and the state vector of the i-th subsystem of (21), (22) as $\mathbf{q}_i$.

Solutions of (21), (22) are bounded:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{s}_i(t, \hat{s}_{i,0}, \eta_i(t))\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} &\leq |\hat{s}_{i,0}| + (\max\{|a|, |b|\} D_\theta + \Delta_\eta)/\varphi_{\min}, \\
\|x_i(t, x_i(0), y_i(0))\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} &\leq \max\{1, \sqrt{x_i(0)^2 + y_i(0)^2}\}, \\
\|y_i(t, x_i(0), y_i(0))\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} &\leq \max\{1, \sqrt{x_i(0)^2 + y_i(0)^2}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Hence for all $\hat{s}_i(0), x_i(0), y_i(0) \in \Omega_s \times \Omega(x', y')$ there exists a constant D_0 such that $\|\mathbf{q}_i(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} \leq D_0$ for all θ_i. Let us rewrite (21), (22) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\hat{s}}_i &= -\varphi_i(\hat{s}_i) + f_i(\xi(t), \hat{\theta}_i(x_i)) \\
\dot{x}_i &= \gamma \|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon \left(x_i - y_i - x_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)\right) + \gamma\delta \cdot \varepsilon_x(x_i, y_i) \\
\dot{y}_i &= \gamma \|\hat{s}_i - s\|_\varepsilon \left(x_i + y_i - y_i(x_i^2 + y_i^2)\right) + \gamma\delta \cdot \varepsilon_y(x_i, y_i),
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_x(x_i(t), y_i(t)) &= x_i(t) - y_i(t) - x_i(t)(x_i^2(t) + y_i^2(t)); \\
\varepsilon_y(x_i(t), y_i(t)) &= x_i(t) + y_i(t) - y_i(t)(x_i^2(t) + y_i^2(t))
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of (16)–(18) is locally Lipschitz in $\hat{s}_i$, x_i, y_i (and so is the right-hand side of (21), (22)). We denote its corresponding Lipschitz constant in the domain specified by (63) by symbol $L_i(D_0)$. Furthermore, provided that (63) holds, $\varepsilon_x(x_i(t), y_i(t))$, $\varepsilon_y(x_i(t), y_i(t))$ are globally bounded with respect to t. Let us denote this bound by symbol B:

$$\max\left\{\|\varepsilon_x(x_i(t), y_i(t))\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}, \|\varepsilon_y(x_i(t), y_i(t))\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}\right\} = B$$

For the sake of notational compactness let us rewrite (64) as follows:

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{q}_i, s(t), \xi(t)) + \gamma\delta \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{q}_i), \tag{65}$$

where $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{q}_i, s(t), \xi(t))$ and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{q}_i)$ are defined to copy the right-hand side of (64). Notice that $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{q}_i, s(t), \xi(t))\| \leq L_i(D_0)\|\mathbf{q}_i\|$, $\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{q}_i)\| \leq B\sqrt{2}$.

According to the theorem on continuous dependence of solutions of an ODE on parameters and initial conditions (see, for instance, (Khalil, 2002) Theorem 3.4, page 96) the following holds:

$$\|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_i^*(t)\| \leq \|\mathbf{q}_i(t_0) - \mathbf{q}_i^*(t_0))\| e^{L_i(D_0)(t-t_0)} + \frac{\delta\gamma B\sqrt{2}}{L_i(D_0)} \left(e^{L_i(D_0)(t-t_0)} - 1\right). \tag{66}$$

When the values of $\hat{s}_{i,0}$ and $\hat{s}_{i,0}^*$ coincide estimate (66) implies that

$$\|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_i^*(t)\| \leq \delta_r e^{L_i(D_0)(t-t_0)} + \frac{\delta\gamma B\sqrt{2}}{L_i(D_0)} \left(e^{L_i(D_0)(t-t_0)} - 1\right). \tag{67}$$

This assures existence of $\delta_r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that for a fixed, yet arbitrarily large, time $T''(\delta_r, \delta) > T'_{\max}$ solutions of system (21), (22) passing through a point from $\Omega(x', y')$ at $t = t_0$ will remain within a fixed, yet arbitrarily small, neighborhood of a solution of system (16)–(18) with initial conditions $x_i(t_0) = x'$, $y_i(t_0) = y'$. The value of $T'_{\max}$ does not depend on δ_r, δ.

Taking (29) into account, we can conclude that the set $x_i^2 + y_i^2 = 1$ is globally attracting in the state space of system (21), (22) for almost all initial conditions (except when $x_i(t_0) = 0$, $y_i(t_0) = 0$). This implies that solutions starting in $\Omega(x', y')$ will remain there. In addition, according to (28), for any $t_0 \geq 0$ a δ_r-vicinity of (x', y') will be visited within at least time $t' \leq t_0 + 2\pi/(\gamma \cdot \delta)$. Hence we have just shown that for all $t_0 \geq 0$ solutions starting at $\Omega_s \times \Omega(x', y')$ approach the target set within a fixed time $T'_{\max}$ and stay in its vicinity for arbitrarily long time $T''(\delta_r, \delta)$. The latter time is a function of δ_r, δ: the smaller the values of δ_r, δ, the larger the value of $T''(\delta_r, \delta)$.

4. Realizability. Let us finally show that system (21), (22) can be realized by a recurrent neural network. More precisely, we wish to prove that there exists a system (8) such that $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\zeta}_1 \oplus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{N_f}$, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i = \zeta_{i,1} \oplus \zeta_{i,2} \oplus \zeta_{i,3}$, $i = \{1, \ldots, N_f\}$ and solutions $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i(t, \mathbf{q}_{i,0})$ are sufficiently close to $\mathbf{q}_i(t, \mathbf{q}_{i,0})$, where $\mathbf{q}_{i,0} \in \Omega_s \times \Omega(x', y') \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.

It is clear that the right-hand side of (21), (22) is a continuous and locally Lipschitz function. To proceed further we use the following result by Cybenko (Cybenko, 1989):

Theorem 2 (Cybenko, 1989) *Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be any continuous sigmoid-type function. Then finite sums of the form*

$$G(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \sigma(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j^T \boldsymbol{\zeta} + \beta_j),\ \boldsymbol{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^m,\ \boldsymbol{\omega}_j \in \mathbb{R}^m,\ \alpha_j,\ \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}$$

are dense in $\mathcal{C}[0,1]^n$.

According to Theorem 2, for any arbitrarily small $\varepsilon_N \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, any given bounded intervals $\Omega_x \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\Omega_y \subset \mathbb{R}$, and any

$$s(t), \xi(t) :\ \max\{\|s(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}, \|\xi(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]}\} < M,\ M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0},$$

there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_j \in \mathbb{R}^5$, $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \sigma(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j^T \cdot (\xi(t) \oplus s(t) \oplus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i) + \beta_j) - \mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t)) - \gamma\delta \cdot \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i) \right| < \varepsilon_N, \tag{68}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \in \Omega_s \oplus \times\Omega_x \times \Omega_y$. It follows from (68) that there exist N, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_j$, α_j, β_j such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \sigma(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j^T \cdot (\xi(t) \oplus s(t) \oplus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i) + \beta_j) = \mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t)) + \gamma\delta \cdot \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i) + \Delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t)), \tag{69}$$

where $\Delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t))$ is continuous and

$$|\Delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t))| < \varepsilon_N.$$

Let us chose $\Omega_x = [-v, v]$, $\Omega_y = [-v, v]$ where $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $v > 1$ and consider the dynamics of

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_i = \mathbf{f}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t)) + \gamma\delta \cdot \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i) + \Delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i, s(t), \xi(t)). \tag{70}$$

System (70) has a globally attracting invariant set (for almost all initial conditions) which can be characterized as follows

$$\{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3 |\ 1 - \rho(\varepsilon_N) \leq \zeta_{i,2}^2 + \zeta_{i,3}^2 \leq 1 + \rho(\varepsilon_N)\},\ \rho \in \mathcal{K}_\infty.$$

This follows immediately from the fact that (65) is structurally stable and has a globally attracting invariant set (for almost all initial conditions). Furthermore, for any given ε_N and a bounded set of initial conditions $\Omega_\zeta(r) = \{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3 |\ \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i\| \leq r,\ r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$ there exists constant B_1 such that $\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i(t)\|_{\infty,[0,\infty]} < B_1$. Hence solutions of system

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \sigma(\boldsymbol{\omega}_j^T \cdot (\boldsymbol{\zeta}_i \oplus s(t) \oplus \xi(t) + \beta_j) \tag{71}$$

are bounded for all initial conditions from $\Omega_\zeta(r)$ provided that inequality (68) holds over sufficiently large intervals Ω_x, Ω_y (for sufficiently large v). Furthermore, given that ε_N is sufficiently small, solutions of (71) enter domain $\Omega_s \times \Omega(x', y')$ specified by (62) in finite time. Finally, according to equality (69) and Theorem 3.4 in (Khalil, 2002), solutions of (71) starting in $\Omega(x', y')$ satisfy the following inequality:

$$\|\mathbf{q}_i(t, \mathbf{q}_{i,0}) - \boldsymbol{\zeta}_i(t, \mathbf{q}_{i,0})\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_N}{L_i(D_0)} \left(e^{L_i(D_0)(t-t_0)} - 1\right),\ \mathbf{q}_{i,0} \in \Omega_s \times \Omega(x', y'). \tag{72}$$

Hence, for any $t \geq 0$, solutions of (71) starting from $\Omega_\zeta(r)$ approach the target set within a fixed time (dependant on δ) and stay in its vicinity arbitrary long provided that δ and ε_N are sufficiently small. The possibility of the latter follows from Theorem 2.

Taking (72), (67), (23), (21) into account we conclude the proof by choosing $h_{f,i}(\mathbf{x}, s)$, $h_{\theta,i}(\mathbf{x}, s)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} h_{f,i}(\mathbf{x}, s) &= h_{f,i}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{N_f}, s) = s - \zeta_{i,1}, \\ h_{\theta,i}(\mathbf{x}, s) &= h_{\theta,i}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{N_f}, s) = a + \frac{b-a}{2}(\zeta_{i,2} + 1) \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

The theorem is proven.

Before concluding this section we would like to provide several remarks regarding Theorem 1.

Remark 1 (Read-out from the outputs) As follows from the theorem the class of signal $s(t) = s_i(t, s_{i,0}, \theta_i, \eta_i(t))$, e.g. parameter i, can be inferred from the values of $h_{f,j}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))$, $j = \{1, \ldots, N_f\}$ within a finite interval of time. The values of $h_{f,i}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))$ should approach a small neighborhood of zero and stay there for a sufficiently long time. The estimate of θ_i up to its equivalence class is available from the values of $h_{\theta,i}(\mathbf{x}(t), s(t))$ over the same interval.

From a practical viewpoint, however, it is preferable to read-out from the RNN outputs explicitly, rather than having to satisfy ourselves with the existence of two sets of read-out functions, for state and input, respectively, of the RNN. Even though this option is not stated explicitly in Theorem 1, it can be easily shown that the preferred option can, indeed, be realized. Adding to recurrent subsystem (8) a *feed-forward* part realizing continuous "output" functions (73) enables explicit read-out from the RNN outputs.

Remark 2 (Convergence to an attractor) Theorem 1 does not imply that recognition of a class of the input signal $s(t)$ involves convergence of the RNN state to an attractor. Yet its formulation does not exclude this option either. In fact, when $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ satisfies some additional restrictions (e.g. linear or monotone parametrization with respect to θ_i), it is possible to replace (17), (18) with another prototype system: one that converges to a point attractor exponentially (Tyukin et al., 2007). This implies that it depends substantially on the properties of $f_i(\xi(t), \theta_i)$ whether the state of a network will behave intermittently or asymptotically converge to an attractor. It is important, however, that in both cases the recognition problem will be successfully solved by a RNN.

Remark 3 (Multidimensional uncertainty) Even though the theorem applies to the case where θ_i is a scalar, it can be trivially extended to the case where uncertain parameters are vectors from a bounded domain $\Omega_{\theta,d} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. To do so one needs to find a Lipschitz mapping $\boldsymbol{\lambda} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for a given small $\varepsilon_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ the following property holds:

$$\forall\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \in \Omega_{\theta,d}\ \exists\ \theta_i \in \Omega_\theta :\ \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\theta_i)\| < \varepsilon_\lambda$$

Hence the problem will reduce to the scalar case to which Theorem 1 applies.

5 Conclusion

We provided a theoretical justification to the important question why an RNN with fixed weights can serve as a universal adaptive classifier of both static and dynamic inputs. In addition to providing an existence proof we have proven that the number of dynamical states in an RNN recognizing n different signals $s_i(t)$ can be as small as $3n$, i.e. grows linearly with the size of the set of uncertain signals to be classified.

We stated the classification and recognition problems in a behavioral context in which, over time, the desired input-output relationship is achieved. Finding a solution corresponds to a network dynamics in which the state reaches a given neighborhood of the a-priori specified set and stays there for sufficiently long time, provided that input to the network belongs to a given class (Problem 1). With these ramifications, RNN solve the problem of adaptively classifying time-dependent signals. We did not set out to guarantee, however, that the state of the RNN will asymptotically converge to an equilibrium or its small vicinity as a result of recognition. On the other hand the amount of time a network would spend in the vicinity of a target set can be made sufficiently large to qualify as a practical solution to the classification problem. For classification, after all, asymptotic convergence is not needed.

In physics and nonlinear dynamics the phenomenon that the state of a system reaches a neighborhood of a set and stays there sufficiently long, yet inevitably escaping – only to get caught again, is called (chaotic) itinerancy (Kaneko & Tsuda, 2003); the set is referred to as an attractor-ruin. These descriptive concepts are currently recognized as a possible mathematical basis for modeling brain activity (Tsuda, 1991; Tsuda & Fujii, 2004). We envisage that our current result supports this idea, by showing the considerable power of these systems to perform adaptive classification.

References

Back, A., & Chen, T. (2002). Universal approximation of multiple nonlinear operators by neural networks. *Neural Computation*, *14*, 2561–2566.

Chen, T., & Amari, S. (2001). Stability of asymmetric Hopfield networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, *12*(1), 159–163.

Chen, T., & Chen, H. (1995). Universal approximation to nonlinear operators by neural newtorks with arbitrary activation functions and its application to dynamical systems. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, *6*(4), 911–917.

Cohen, M., & Grossberg, S. (1983). Absolute stability and global pattern formation and parallel memory storage by competitive neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, *13*, 815–826.

Cybenko, G. (1989). Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *Math. of Control, Signals and Systems*, *2*, 303–314.

Feldkamp, L., & Puskorius, G. (1997). Fixed-weight controller for multiple systems. In *Proc. of the IEEE international joint conference on neural networks* (pp. 2268–2272).

Feldkamp, L., Puskorius, G., & Moore, P. (1996). Adaptation from fixed weight dynamic networks. In *Proc. of the IEEE international conference on neural networks.*

Fuchs, A., & Haken, H. (1988). Pattern recognition and associative memory as dynamical prosesses in a synergetic system (I and II). *Biological Cybernetics*, *60.*

Gorban, A. (2004). Singularities of transition processes in dynamical systems: Qualitative theory of critical delays. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, *Monograph 05.*

Guckenheimer, J., & Holmes, P. (2002). *Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems and bifurcations of vector fields.* Springer.

Hopfield, J. J. (1982). Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *PNAS*, *79*, 2554–2558.

Kaneko, K., & Tsuda, I. (2003). Chaotic itinerancy. *Chaos*, *13*(3), 926–936.

Khalil, H. (2002). *Nonlinear systems (3d edition).* Prentice Hall.

Lo, J. (2001). Adaptive vs. accommodative neural networks for adaptive system identification. In *Proc. of the IEEE international joint conference on neural networks* (pp. 1279–1284).

Loria, A., Panteley, E., Popovic, D., & Teel, A. (2003). Persistency of excitation for uniform convergence in nonlinear control systems. *http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0301335.*

Lu, W., & Chen, T. (2003). New conditions on global stability of Cohen-Grossberg neural networks. *Neural Computation*, *15*, 1173–1189.

Michel, A., Farrel, J. A., & Porod, W. (1989). Qualitative analysis of neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems*, *36*, 229–243.

Milnor, J. (1985). On the concept of attractor. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, *99*, 177-195.

Pavlov, A. (2004). *The output regulation problem: a convergent dynamics approach.* PhD. Dissertation, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands.

Prokhorov, D. V., Feldkamp, L. A., & Tyukin, I. Y. (2002). Adaptive behavior with fixed weights in recurrent neural networks. In *Proc. of IEEE international joint conference on neural networks* (Vol. 3, pp. 2018–2022). Hawaii, USA.

Tsuda, I. (1991). Chaotic itinerancy as a dynamical basis of hermeneutics in brain and mind. *World futures*, *32*, 167–184.

Tsuda, I., & Fujii, H. (2004). A complex systems approach to an interpretation of dynamic brain activity I: Chaotic itinerancy can provide a mathematical basis for information processing in cortical transitory and nonstationary dynamics. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, *3146*, 109–128.

Tyukin, I., Steur, E., Nijmeijer, H., & van Leeuwen, C. (2007). Non-uniform small-gain theorems for systems with unstable invariant sets. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*. (accepted as per recent from the Editor, preprint is available at http://arxiv.org/abs/math.DS/0612381)

Tyukin, I. Y., Prokhorov, D. V., & van Leeuwen, C. (2007). Adaptation and parameter estimation in systems with unstable target dynamics and nonlinear parametrization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*. (to appear in October issue, preprint available at http://arxiv.org/abs/math.OC/0506419)

Yang, H., & Dillon, T. (1994). Exponential stability and oscillation of Hopfield networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, *5*, 719–729.

Younger, S., Conwell, P., & Cotter, N. (1999). Fixed-weight on-line learning. *IEEE Trans. on Neural Networks*, *10*(2), 272–283.